

REMARKS

I. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

A. Claim 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-11, 13, 14, and 16-18

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-11, 13, 14, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chern (US 2003/0060211). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Chern discloses a wireless location-based information-retrieval system including a wireless communication device. The wireless device has a transceiver for sending and receiving communications across a wireless communication network, a position-determination device for determining the location of the wireless device, and an Internet browser. A remote server communicates with the wireless device. The server receives the location data from the wireless device over the network and maintains a web page listing information service options. The information service options are accessible to and selectable by the wireless device via the browser. The server retrieves information from a database based on the location data provided by the wireless device and on the selected service option. The retrieved information is sent to the wireless device over the network. (Chern, Abstract)

The Examiner's attention is directed to the fact that Chern fails to disclose "means for determining a preferred medium for presentation of said message in a first format, and for determining an alternative medium for presentation of said message in a second format", as recited in independent claim 1, or "determining a preferred medium for presentation of information related to said at least one information object in a first format according to said specification message, and determining an alternative medium for presentation in a second format", as recited in independent claim 10.

In contrast Chern discloses that user information allows server 136 to format a response based on the user's past preferences (¶ [0057]). Chern also discloses displaying a list of services or audibly announcing available selections to a user (¶ [0060]). In addition, Chern discloses an alert feature (¶ [0048]). However, there is no teaching in Chern of a determining a preferred medium and an alternative medium as

recited by Applicant's claims. As such, independent claims 1 and 10 are patentable over the Chern reference.

Claims 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 11, 13, 14 and 16-18 are patentable at least by virtue of depending from their respective base claims. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

B. Claims 19-21

Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yokota (US 2004/0102898). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Yokota discloses guiding a user to a destination while providing area-specific information useful for guiding and warning the user such as local traffic laws, driving conditions, traffic customs, weather conditions, etc. that is specifically tailored for each user. The area-specific information is customized for a user in order to give the area-specific information to the user that is most relevant to that particular user. The navigation system informs the user of the area-specific information that is different from that of the user's home area or the information specific to the calculated route to the destination or unique to the current location of the user. Further, the navigation system customizes the calculated route such that driving conditions and situations that are unfamiliar to the user will be minimized. (Yokota, Abstract)

The Examiner's attention is directed to the fact that Yokota fails to disclose "determining a presentation format for the guiding information message according to a medium that is available to the user and appropriate to the user's circumstances according to a predetermined priority level", as recited in independent claim 19, or "means for determining preferred medium for presentation of information related to said at least one information object in a first format according to said specification, and for determining an alternative medium for presentation in a second format", as recited in independent claim 21

In contrast Yokota discloses that its navigation system lists the traffic information by placing a high priority to important differences from that of the user's home city and recent changes in traffic laws. (See Yokota, ¶ [0025]) Yokota also discloses that the

navigation system guides the user to the destination as well as showing the user the traffic information specific to the particular area, calculated route or the current user location. (See Yokota, ¶ [0026]) Yokota clearly delineates a difference between “traffic” information and “guiding” information. As such, the Examiner’s reading of the traffic information of Yokota on the guiding information of Applicant’s claims is improper. As such, there is no teaching in Yokota of “determining a presentation format for the guiding information message according to a medium that is available to the user and appropriate to the user’s circumstances according to a predetermined priority level”, as recited in independent claim 19. In addition, Yokota is devoid of any teaching or disclosure of a preferred medium and an alternative medium, as recited in independent claim 21. As such, independent claims 19 and 21 are patentable over the Yokota reference.

Claim 20 is patentable at least by virtue of depending from its respective base claim. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. Claims 3 and 12

Claims 3 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over Chern in view of DeLorme (US 6,321,158). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

DeLorme discloses an integrated routing/mapping information system where a user plans a trip using a first computer and downloads information about the trip into a second, mobile computer (e.g., PDA). The PDA has a display or speaker for presenting routing information (visually or verbally). The second computer is coupled to a GPS system in order to co-ordinate route information from the first computer with a current location of the user.

The Examiner concedes that Chern fails to teach that the information can be replaced with a stored abstraction of the object from a symbol database. In order to cure the Examiner’s perceived deficiency of Chern, DeLorme is cited.

As argued above in Section I. A., Chern also fails to disclose “means for determining a preferred medium for presentation of said message in a first format, and for determining an alternative medium for presentation of said message in a second format”, as recited in independent claim 1, or “determining a preferred medium for presentation of information related to said at least one information object in a first format according to said specification message, and determining an alternative medium for presentation in a second format”, as recited in independent claim 10. DeLorme fails to cure this deficiency.

As such, claims 3 and 12 are patentable over the combination of Chern and DeLorme. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

B. Claims 6 and 15

Claims 6 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over Chern in view of Buckham, et al. (US 6,662,016) (Buckham). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Buckham discloses providing graphical display information regarding mobile resources. In the illustrated embodiment, the system (100) provides graphical location information regarding one or more mobile resources (110, 120 and/or 130). The graphical location information is provided via a display (147) associated with a client platform (140). The display includes mapping information and mobile resource marker information transmitted from a server (170) to the client platform (140) via the Internet (180). The mapping information and marker information are provided in separate message sets thereby providing certain processing advantages.

The Examiner concedes that Chern fails to disclose that the target information object includes a representation of another vehicle, as well as the presentation information object includes a representation of a route to intercept the vehicle as a function of predetermined characteristics. In order to cure the Examiner’s perceived deficiency of Chern, Buckham is cited.

As argued above in Section I. A., Chern also fails to disclose “means for determining a preferred medium for presentation of said message in a first format, and

for determining an alternative medium for presentation of said message in a second format", as recited in independent claim 1, or "determining a preferred medium for presentation of information related to said at least one information object in a first format according to said specification message, and determining an alternative medium for presentation in a second format", as recited in independent claim 10. Buckham fails to cure this deficiency.

As such, claims 6 and 15 are patentable over the combination of Chern and Buckham. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas Bethea, Jr.
Registration No. 53,987

Date: 10/08/2008

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-4859
thomas.bethea.jr@ericsson.com